

MINUTES
Educational Opportunity Fund
Board of Directors Retreat
July 15 & 16, 2001

The EOF Board of Directors retreat was held at Saint Peter's College in compliance with the open Public Meetings Act. Mr. Ellsworth Havens, EOF Board Chairperson, presided.

Attendance

The Board members in attendance on Sunday, July 15, 2001 and Monday, July 16, 2001 were: Al Arce, James Avery, Herbert Flamer, Ellsworth Havens, Ernest Jolly, Sang Jin Kim, and William King. Ms. Michelle Softley, President of the New Jersey Educational Opportunity Fund Professional Association, and several institutional EOF directors also attended the retreat/meeting both days. Commission on Higher Education staff in attendance both days were Glenn Lang, Janis Flanagan, and Audrey Bennerson. Dr. James Sulton, Executive Director of the Commission on Higher Education attended on Sunday, July 15, 2001. On Monday, July 16, 2001 Ms. M. Wilma Harris, who serves as the Higher Education Student Assistance Authority's (HESAA) representative joined the EOF Board. Father Loughran, President of Saint Peter's College and Chairperson of the New Jersey Presidents' Council was also in attendance on July 16, 2001, as was Ms. Carol Muka, HESAA staff, and several institutional EOF directors.

Dr. Lang and Chairman Havens thanked Ms. Anne Rosario, the EOF Director at Saint Peter's College, for her assistance in hosting the Board retreat and meeting.

Discussion Items - Sunday, July 15, 2001

Rather than follow a set agenda, the Board members agreed to engage in an open dialogue that included the EOF directors in attendance.

Chairperson Havens thanked the Board members for taking time, on what would normally be a day off, to conduct a macro evaluation of the status of the overall EOF program including funding and program priorities. The intent of the retreat (as previously discussed) was to look at what measures of success the program has, how it

matches up to the EOF legislative and regulatory mandates and the future direction of the program. He suggested that the enabling legislation and regulations guide the actions and activities of the Board as well as the funding priorities and future direction of the program. It has been a long time since the Board has conducted a comprehensive review of the program in relation to the legislation and regulations. The Board has regulations that it approved and adopted in 1999. However, he is concerned that the Board has reviewed elements of the regulations, but has spent little time looking at the overall program as it relates to the regulations. This is an issue of Board accountability -how is the Board monitoring itself in regard to how the regulations are being implemented.

Additionally, Mr. Havens said that as the Board discusses funding for its own activities, it would be helpful to establish parameters defining what the Board has been able to accomplish based on the current funding levels, what could be accomplished with additional funding or conversely what happens if funding is decreased. Each year the Board requests more funds from the legislature and administration but one of the weaknesses apparent to Mr. Havens is an inability to clearly define exactly what will change if an increased/decreased or level appropriation is realized. It is difficult to make a coherent argument regarding why the EOF program's resource needs are more important than some other agencies' resource needs.

Mr. Avery commented that Mr. Havens has brought up both the regulations (which the program should live by), and funding (that the Fund does not receive to implement the things we should do and resources that the institutions do not have) and inquired about exactly what the Board should look at first. It would not be fair to say the Board, CHE/EOF and institutional EOF staff are not doing their jobs when there are several factors impeding what must be done.

Mr. Havens replied that Mr. Avery's comments clearly describe issues faced by the Board and raises the question -- if the regulations require certain things from the institutional programs and the students, is the Board appropriately providing the resources to meet its mandates? The Board needs to begin to look at what it requires, what it is getting, what is the impact on the dollars that we have. He added that it is always a good time for a Board that oversees a major program to sit down and begin to think about these things. There is always a chance that someone will ask the Board (since it is the body empowered to oversee the program) if they have looked at these issues and what the Board is doing about it.

Mr. Arce stated that it seems the executive and legislative branch of state government are already familiar with the program's accountability measures. However, there have been several changes in cabinet level people who respond to the EOF funding requests. He added that EOF is a solid program, has a strong commitment with nothing to hide and the Board markets that. He suggested that the Board should go after an emergency appropriation. A request for an emergency appropriation would communicate to the legislative and executive branch of government the consequences of choosing not to act. The Board has adopted a reactive posture. The Board should go on record as having stated that it did what it could based on level funding, but at this point cannot do anything

more unless the program receives an increase in the appropriation. The state's EOF dollars keep shrinking but the commitment by the institutional programs continues to grow. If EOF's budget is based on basic accounting principles that allow for annual increases in certain costs, then the program is entitled to significantly more than it has requested. EOF's problem is one of money, not the program's accountability.

Dr. Flamer suggested that an appropriate way to approach this issue is to look first at where the program is. He assumes that the presentation on accountability/retention/graduation scheduled for later this afternoon would point out if EOF were doing poorly in some areas. If that is the case, the Board needs to deal with it. Changing the regulations will not necessarily cause magic to happen. The overall program has some problems that must be addressed, but the arguments being made regarding the impact of years of level funding are correct and have contributed to the program's problems. It has been approximately four years since Article IV was increased and that increase was for only \$385,000 to spread across all 56 programs, which had very little impact on service delivery. He added that while he would like to look at where the Board is now and what the Board ought to do with the regulations, but it is more important to obtain an infusion of resources for the program. After reading the funding impact statements submitted by the institutions it is evident that the campus programs are beginning to hemorrhage.

Mr. Jolly commented that while Mr. Havens indicated things have changed since the enabling EOF legislation was adopted, he thought it was important to indicate what things have not changed. What has not changed is the huge gap in the needs of the historically, educationally and economically disadvantaged students who have the potential for higher education attainment. Part of the Board's mandate is to meet that need. Another thing the Board needs to look at is what is its' accountability. It was intentional that the EOF Board is referred to as a Board of Directors. There is an implied accountability in the use of that language although the Board is part of state government, its accountability is to understand and articulate what resources are needed to meet the mandate of the legislation. If the Board fails to articulate clearly what is needed to get the job done, then the Board has been negligent to some degree. The Board should be able to coherently communicate the program's' needs and what will be done with the resources. The Board is ultimately accountable for how the resources are being employed. In addition, the Board is also accountable for informing the State of the impact of receiving the resources requested. When you don't receive the resources you anticipated then you have to immediately adjust your plan. If you ask for a trillion dollars and only receive one billion you can't expect the delivery of the same quantity and quality of services that a trillion dollars would bring. So often the Board drops back to a position of how we are doing with what we are getting and acting as if that is its entire accountability, when it only represents one-third.

Mr. Jolly added that what places the Board and program in this quandary is a subtle and not often spoken of reality. It is a fact that having been appointed by the governor the Board is a part of the executive branch of state government, and there is a tendency to feel an allegiance to whoever the administration is. However, the Board should

remember that the legislation intentionally gave a certain level of independence, which is why Board members terms do not run concurrent with the election and term of the governor. The Board should be careful not to line up behind a preordained outcome until it does its work of accountability. While Mr. Jolly admits that he has not been on the Board as long as some other members, he admits that he has tiptoed around the issues since the last thing one wants to do is to send a message that may not sell well at the Governor's mansion. The best way to kill a program is to raise the expectations, call into question whether the need still exist without substantiating any fact that the need has gone away, and then to under fund the program so you cannot get the job done. Mr. Jolly indicated that it is beginning to feel like that is what is happening to EOF. All of the Board members and the professional association have had positive dialogues with the past and current administrations and the legislature about what is happening to the program, tremendously raising our expectations, yet nothing has changed, particularly during a time of an economic boom for New Jersey. At some point someone (the decision makers) will have to own the consequences of saying no. The Board will not have met its obligation if it only asks for what it thinks it will be able to get.

Dr. Sulton expressed his gratitude to the EOF Board on behalf of the Commission on Higher Education for its dedication and acknowledged the expertise of the staff. He added that he has the honor of working with the CHE/EOF staff everyday and thought the Board should know that no weakness has occurred there. The Board has spoken quite well about what occurred this year. Dr. Lang has done an excellent job of demonstrating that data does not lie. One of his charts shows the congruence between the Board's request and the CHE's request every year, and in only one year (2001) do the bar graphs display true congruence. The CHE wants to work this coming year to see that it gets back in sync with the EOF Board. He urged the Board not to mistake what happened this past budget year and commented that Chairperson Havens did an excellent job of stepping up to the floor to ensure that EOF was clearly in the viewfinder of the policy makers. Dr. Sulton believes that EOF, as a statewide program lost the request early in the game. At the point when the previous governor left EOF had been zeroed out of the budget and we never really succeeded in getting the EOF request reinstated. As Dr. Sulton watched the dynamics unfold and saw in the end that policy makers were primarily concerned about doing things in their individual districts. There is no Xmas tree ornament associated with EOF. The ornaments that were being hung tended to be institutional ornaments for a college or university, in a given district. Despite our advocacy EOF is regarded as a statewide request. Perhaps in the coming year at the institutional level EOF can be promoted as a do or die notion by presidents and boards of trustees and in Dr. Sulton's opinion that has not occurred thus far. Also, when the budget dynamics were recapped the concerns that were expressed successfully at the institutional level were student-centered requests, but did not reflect the pattern of success that EOF has had. Further, the Board was right in pointing out that we don't celebrate EOF sufficiently. We still have some work to do in demonstrating the success that EOF has achieved by virtue of the outstanding alumni, programmatic success, by virtue of the respect that it has on campus and so forth. We need to do a better job of celebrating EOF in the districts and at the campus level then we have been able to do up to now. Finally, the students themselves are the best walking advertisement for the success of the

program. Getting the students front and center is important because they are not just ambassadors, but are proof. Every time students speak before a policy making Board they usually engender the response "that is what we are all about" and "that is what we are here for" we must get the State of New Jersey to say that. The Board is quite right to focus on accountability. He indicated that he and Chairperson Havens have talked about this issue on numerous occasions. No program in higher education is above improvement and we will never know whether or not we are doing better unless we measure that.

Dr. Sulton added that while he appreciates the focus on accountability, we can't continually deny the impediments that are created as a result of the absence of funding. There can be some reluctance to speak about EOF at your institution because the EOF program has inadvertently become a cost. The program has to get back into the benefits column. Dr. Sulton shared that we are in the midst of the budget process for 2003 and the first meeting of the working group between the CHE and Presidents' Council was held June 27, 2001. He has spoken with Dr. Lang about finding a different way to do the budget drill since the past methods have perennially failed. Dr. Sulton acknowledged the hard work of Michelle Softley on behalf of NJEOFPA. .

Mr. Avery commented that Mr. Jolly's comments gave him a mental outline of how he believes the Board should proceed. The Board knows that its programs are outstanding and even under current fiscal circumstances can show outstanding accountability at the institutional and Board level. However, the Board needs to articulate numerically and otherwise all the Fund can accomplish.

Mr. Arce inquired if emergency appropriations exist. Dr. Lang replied if you can convince an administration that an emergency or need for a supplemental appropriation exists then it is within the power of the executive and legislative branches of government to grant. The FY2002 appropriations act empowers the state treasurer to make, if necessary an emergency supplemental appropriation to TAG, as an administrative executive action that requires no further legislative approval, should the demand for TAG exceed the FY2002 allocation. In order to obtain a supplemental appropriation an agency has to be "on point", know exactly how it will be used, and if it needs to be built into the base budget, because you are asking legislators/governors to put your program above all others because this emergency must be addressed. Mr. Arce commented that the EOF program has received level funding in Article IV for the last three fiscal years. It is still his contention that there are State funds available and the program has to do something to call attention to itself. If the Board is challenged, they should be prepared to present its number, programs, need and mission.

Mr. Avery stated that the impact statements clearly show statistically that level funding is painful and at this juncture, the Board needs to be pragmatic.

Mr. Jolly inquired if in fact money were not an issue, how many students could and should the Board be seeking to serve if the enabling legislation were taken literally. Mr. Jolly believes this approach will speak most clearly to the executive branch of the government. Dr. Lang responded that the CHE/EOF staff can provide information on

potential target population to a degree. The staff has the ability to identify the students who meet the EOF income eligibility guidelines, but since program admission is based on a dual guideline of income eligibility and educational disadvantage, the second part is more difficult to determine because the staff does not have access to admissions applications. There are three larger issues and the Board needs to determine which is more important: (1) expanding the number of students enrolled, (2) doing a better job with our current population, or (3) expanding the number we enroll and doing better. Dr. Lang added that a couple of things stopped the expansion of the program. A number of institutions are concerned about the proportion of their freshman class occupied by EOF students and have no desire to expand beyond its current number. Some institutions are dependent upon EOF to meet their freshman enrollment numbers, but there are several who do not want to see the increase go from 11-12% to over 20%. Prior to the 1980's, the mission of the program was primarily access. Programs were judged by how many students were enrolling but no questions were asked about how students were doing. As soon as the Board began to expand its focus to student outcomes, some programs (given their resources) put the brakes on size because they could no longer take chances with large numbers of "high-risk" students. One of the things that came to light as the PPC were examined several years ago is that there are two general groups of programs. The first group of programs is characterized as "high risk, high-access" and takes a lot of chances on students. These programs' retention rates tend to be lower. The other group of programs doesn't take a large number of "high risk" students or urban students from Newark, Trenton, Jersey City and Camden and their retention rates are slightly higher. The CHE/EOF staff can report how many students meet the income criteria and poll EOF directors to determine how many students were turned away. This will take some time and will include multiple applications because approximately one-third of the applicants apply to more than one program creating an overlap. Another question is how many students know about EOF but aren't applying, which is something we cannot answer because the Department of Education (DOE) does not keep unit records which would allow us to begin an analysis of high school graduates by income and post-secondary attendance patterns.

Dr. Flamer indicated that it is his understanding some of the institutions that are not making ten percent are being affected by the lack of resources for student services. Dr. Lang replied that for example some of the institutional funding impact statements indicate there are programs with no funds for tutorial services. It would be his recommendation not to enroll high-risk students if you are not able to provide them with tutoring. The nationally available data from the Federal Student Support Services programs conducted by Westat, indicates two of the most important things related to student success is first the number of hours per subject that a student receives in tutoring and second, is a minimum number of counseling contact hours per student with the program. When you look at schools that have 100, 150, 180 students per counselor there is concern about how they can have 20 meaningful contacts per student each semester.

Dr. Kim inquired if the Board needed the approval of the CHE to raise the income eligibility criteria? Dr. Lang replied that unlike other Boards in the state, the EOF Board has wide regulatory authority in its enabling regulations. The authority to operationally

define “needy” as educationally and economically disadvantaged, and to set the related income eligibility criteria rests with the Board. Dr. Flamer commented that although the Board has adjusted the income eligibility criteria for inflation, the income of the population of students served (\$26,000) continues to fall well below what is permitted for a family size of four (\$34,100). This means that the program is providing services to those it was intended to serve, the most needy, however, you can't continue to ask the programs to create miracles without the appropriate resources. It has been quite a challenge to get the administration and the legislature to understand that EOF is not solely a student grant program, but a complete educational program. Dr. Flamer suggested that the Board write the governor a letter and request a meeting.

Ms. Bennerson stated that it is usually the case that if the governor includes a recommendation for an increase for EOF in his/her proposed budget it is supported by the legislature. Dr. Lang interjected that the legislature denied the governor's full request for increased EOF funding once, in the last year of the Florio administration, decreasing Florio's recommended increase from \$2.5 million to \$1.6 million for EOF. Ms. Bennerson indicated that the point she was attempting to make and was made by Dr. Sulton in his opening remarks, is that the program was defeated from the beginning because former Governor Whitman did not include additional support for EOF in her proposed budget. Whoever the next governor is, EOF needs to be included in his proposed budget from the beginning. When EOF is included in the proposal from the governor the likelihood that increased funding is realized stands a better chance, then getting a legislator to include EOF later.

Dr. Lang was also asked to discuss how the budget process works in a transitional election year. His response was that each administration has a different budget process. A more formal process occurred during the Kean administration where "what/if" justifications were required. Since the Kean administration, the process has been more open-ended. The challenge this year will be that the budget is going forward now with the current administration who has to get the process started. Sometime in December-January there will be a transition process and in the past the new administrations have not tinkered much with the proposed budget inherited from the previous administration. The big changes generally occur during the second year of a new administration.

Dr. Kim stated that most of our legislators generally know about EOF but do not know in detail what the program does. He expressed the need for a brochure that introduces the program and can be shared with the legislators and other key individuals. Mr. Jolly commented that on several occasions the Board has discussed the development of a brochure that tells the EOF story. The Board should move on this by determining the resources that can be put behind it, and when the Board would like the project completed. Anyone who has met with legislators knows that you need to be able to provide them with something that they can glance at and review in fifteen minutes.

Mr. Havens expressed that since the Board has not been successful, perhaps it needs to change its' sense of direction and how it plays the game, which is not intended to criticize the CHE, individual legislators or the governors. His beliefs are based on some of the comments made by Dr. Kim and Mr. Jolly, as well as his issue with the regulations. Is

the Board clear about the goals and objectives of the Fund and can the Board articulate those goals and objectives to a larger audience? The Board needs to reposition itself and to do that requires that it approach a broader audience to articulate the Fund's vision, goals and accomplishments to the larger media, larger organizations and groups. The Fund has had a significant impact on the State of New Jersey and has opened doors for countless numbers of people yet greater discussions are held about dredging the Morris canal, opening a battleship in Camden or a new minor league stadium, in a city in which the average attendance is 2,000 people. The Board annually provides 13,000 people with the opportunity to succeed in life and there is nothing else in the State of New Jersey that has that kind of impact on people, but no one knows about it.

Mr. Jolly indicated that the Board should tell the story the way the Board would like to have it understood. The best way to start is with a straightforward, simple brochure that lays out the EOF story and journey. A professional public relations firm should help write it. This will ensure that when Board members speak to people on a repeated basis that they will stay on message.

Mr. Arce stated that if the Board decides to move ahead with the brochure it should be in conjunction with a strategy that will have an impact on the key players or the brochure will probably be treated like junk mail. Further, Mr. Arce stated that in the past we have been conservative in our budget requests. He suggested that the Board go back to the FY1999 budget request, multiple that budget request figure by the amount requested in FY2001 and use the result to go after an emergency appropriation for the program. Mr. Arce acknowledged that the request could be denied, but would be controversial enough to garner the attention of the administration. He passionately stated a need for the legislature and governor to understand that not funding the EOF program has an impact. EOF was initially funded in response to a controversial issue; today the program is no longer controversial. He further stated that two years ago he was upset to learn that the program's funding request was not honored and this was during a time when New Jersey had the highest possible budgetary surplus.

Dr. Lang commented that the Board began this conversation with a discussion of outcomes retention and graduation rates. Outcomes are being produced as the game and the institutional playing fields are being changed. While the EOF program may have the same mission to bring in "high-risk" educationally and economically disadvantaged students, New Jersey's institutions have undergone a rapid transformation in the last couple of years. The institutions have become more competitive and their expectations for students' performance have accelerated. Looking at graduation and retention rates one must understand within the funding discussion that is taking place that things are not improving in the urban school districts. Educational reform has not had an impact beyond the elementary school level and if you look at standardized test scores at the eighth and eleventh grade levels they are going down in the Abbott districts and for Black and Latino students. It is important for the Board to understand the inputs (students) that EOF directors are working with to get into college, help retain and graduate.

Dr. King asked what strategies have been tried, what strategies have failed, which were successful and where should the Board go from there. He commented that it sounds as though Board members are rehashing a history that has not gone anywhere. He is sure that the chairperson and other Board members have spoken to senators and assemblypersons and tried to pull strings with the appropriate political arms.

Mr. Havens responded that the Board has addressed the situation by developing an annual budget request, which goes to the CHE and either, does or does not receive the CHE's total support. The CHE submits the EOF request as part of the overall CHE request. This is forwarded to the governor's office where an overall state budget is proposed and forwarded to the legislature for review and ratification. The process has been successful when the governor's office accepts the CHE recommendation and includes it in the budget proposal, which is what occurred in FY2001 when EOF received an increase in academic year student grants. If the CHE request for EOF is not contained in the governor's budget proposal, the CHE, the Board and EOF Professional Association have not been successful in their efforts to get the legislature to include an appropriation increase for EOF. Dr. Lang indicated that in his tenure with higher education, the legislature included only one program in the higher education budget that neither the governor nor the Department of Higher Education requested and that was the College Bound programs in Trenton, Newark, Camden and Jersey City. The Chair of the Appropriations Committee at that time was the late John Watson and he put the funds in the higher education budget. Dr. Lang added that one of the operational difficulties for the CHE is that it is not a cabinet level agency. Cabinet level agencies undergo a much more structured budget process and the CHE over the last few years has attempted to start their budget process earlier in an effort to get on the same timeline and have the same input as the cabinet departments. One problem is that the cabinet departments meet regularly with the governor, where as the CHE does not.

Ms. Flanagan pointed out that three years ago, EOF received an increase of \$385,000 in Article IV that was not part of the Governor's original budget recommendation. Dr. Lang elaborated that this occurred before the legislative hearings. The Board and EOFPA were becoming a bit noisy because the program was flat-funded. In the give and take between the CHE and the governor's office, treasury was directed to increase the EOF Article IV appropriation recommendation by \$385,000 so that it would be a non-issue by the date of the legislative hearings. In actuality there are three levels of budget announcements by the Governor's Office. The first is the governor's state-of-the-state message where some new initiative in higher education may be announced i.e. the county college-funding act. The second is the governor's formal budget message and the third is the back and forth between departments and agencies with the governor's office and the treasury department that occurs between the governor's formal budget message and the legislative hearings.

Dr. King sought further clarification and asked if the problem lies with the CHE's input with the governor. Mr. Jolly responded that if history continues to repeat itself the major point of emphasis has to be ensuring that the governor includes the CHE's recommendation for EOF in his/her formal budget message. In addition, having key

legislators that are letting the governor's office know that EOF is also important to them may help.

Dr. King asked if the CHE has always agreed with the EOF Board's economic needs. Dr. Lang stated the answer is no, and added that over the past few years with the relationship between the chair of the EOF Board and the help of the CHE membership on the EOF Board things have come together. Additionally, Dr. Flamer explained that last fall (2000) Mr. Havens, Dr. Kim and he had a meeting with the Executive Committee of the CHE to discuss the Article IV issue and explain in detail why the funds were being requested. Dr. Lang commented that the budget process contains two levels of documentation-the CHE's budget policy statement and an internal document called the CHE budget request (actual dollar amounts, separate from the budget policy statement), which goes forth to the Office of Management and Budget(OMB). The CHE for the last two years has adopted almost verbatim the EOF budget document and sent that forth to OMB who puts together the governor's budget.

Mr. Havens described his experience this last year as having been in constant conversation with Dr. Sulton. In meetings with the previous governor's staff, a series of questions and issues were raised relative to what the program does, how it relates to the institutions, etc., which to a certain extent showed a fundamental understanding and agreement about what the Fund does, but that perhaps people think that the problem has been solved or no longer exist.

Mr. Arce stated that the Board might want to identify two bipartisan senators and assemblypersons that would really advocate on behalf of the program and could walk the EOF request through the budget process.

Dr. King asked if the process is not working because the Board is unable to get advocates on the legislative level and if that is the case, why does the Board put effort into going through the CHE and OMB? Mr. Jolly replied that with the higher education restructuring act the Board has to work with the CHE. There was real work that had to be done and through a couple of EOF Board chairs and the good works of the staff we have a consensus of agreement on the process. The Board was a little naïve to believe that just following the traditional process would then translate to a better outcome, because we were working with an administration that had created the higher education restructuring act. Therefore, the Board believed that if you provided the data and worked together with the CHE (particularly in good economic times) success was not assured but highly probable. The reality the Board has discovered is that it was not good enough, because the budget process contains other idiosyncrasies. Even when the CHE is in accord they are not at the table with all of the other chief players. Somebody has to be advocating on EOF's behalf or you have to have a squeaky wheel in the public arena just to ensure that you have a headline.

Mr. Arce suggested that the Board has to change its philosophy. The governor and legislature need to fund the program because the state is doing a poor job of educational preparation in the K-12 system and EOF can help the state.

Mr. Havens stated that in his experience this past year as the chair of the EOF Board that no legislators contacted him to discuss higher education, equal opportunity, collegiate/student issues or anything else about which every legislator claims is one of the leading issues confronting the country today. Yet they would tell you in person that what the EOF Board does is a top priority. The students EOF serves are considered to be one of the top issues in the State of New Jersey. But, how many legislators have spoken to a member of the EOF Board? If EOF is addressing a key issue, then the Board needs to change their tactics and strategies.

Mr. Avery commented the key is to the governor's office and the Board has to speak with the governor, as well as get eye contact and handshakes with the major candidates who wish to be governor. The brochure is important, the NJEOFPA has to do a better job of lobbying on behalf of EOF, not just the president of the organization, but all of the campus directors, as well as identify legislative advocates for EOF as suggested by Mr. Arce.

Dr. Flamer stated that the Board has played the game by the rules, but now needs to look at how other organizations in Trenton who have an interest in higher education are playing the game. There are full-time people who have the interests of the state colleges, independent, county colleges and Rutgers in mind who are walking the corridors. While the EOF Board cannot support that activity, the "larger community of EOF interests in the state are much bigger than the EOF Board" and has to support strong consistent advocacy for the program.

Mr. Havens asked when was the last time the Board held a large broad public forum, inclusive of individuals not directly involved in higher education. Dr. Lang responded that it has been sometime. Ms. Softley recalled that this type of forum happened for the 20th anniversary of the program.

As a follow-up to Dr. Flamer's remarks Ms. Bennerson related that at the appropriation committee hearings when legislators asked questions about the EOF Program there were college presidents who spoke eloquently about their wholehearted support for the program. But, as Dr. Sulton pointed out earlier, unless the program receives this type of endorsement consistently from all of the institutional presidents, EOF will never become an ornament on any institution's Xmas tree if the program is not included in the governor's budget initially. Dr. Lang added that he can not over emphasize the amount of time Jim Avery, Ernest Jolly, Herb Flamer and the Board chair Ellsworth Havens have put in behind the scene with all of the individuals who make decisions about the higher education budget. Prior to the higher education restructuring act, the EOF Board never came close to the governor's office. Since higher education restructuring, the individuals who have served as the chair of the Board are the first to have ever met with the OMB staff, the governor's policy council, the governor's staff and even the governor. New Jersey also has a very strong governor rather than legislative system of government. The most important thing in New Jersey's governing process is to get your desired budget needs included in the governor's budget. Dr. Lang also acknowledged the work of the

NJEOFPA, in particular the president Michelle Softley who touched base and sat down with almost all of New Jersey's legislative leaders this past year.

Dr. King stated that the Board members are well versed about what has happened but wanted to know what the plan of action will be for FY2003.

Mr. Jolly stated that the one thing that has not been done is a news conference designed to create some controversy for a constructive outcome. There must be at least one or two reporters who follow education. As it relates to EOF, Dr. Flamer pointed out that no one is walking the halls of the legislature on behalf of EOF. Dr. King indicated that one plan of action is to create a news conference or legislative forum on EOF. Dr. Flamer indicated that the focus of the forum could be on what the candidates are saying about higher education. If they don't have EOF as part of their higher education policy and strategy, then that needs to be pointed out.

Mr. Havens indicated that the EOF Board has made it too easy for the governor and legislature because when the program receives level funding it has not indicated that it was not an appropriate level of funding, thus making it a non-issue.

Dr. King summarized that the Board's recommendations thus far include a need to add to the process and the need to hold an educational forum. Dr. Flamer stated that the Board has inflicted enough blame upon itself and another budget season is just around the corner. He believes that Dr. King is suggesting that the Board outline some action steps.

Dr. Lang provided the Board members with a power point presentation on the history of the budget appropriation since the inception of the program in 1968. Extensive Article IV program support was not part of the original program design. The original thinking was to provide students with a financial aid grant and a little counseling and tutoring. The summer program did not start until 1973. Article IV funding was cut in 1972 and 1973 and began to increase again in 1977. The flat periods for Article IV funding were fiscal years 1983-85, 1991-94, 1997-98, and 00-02. The large decline in Article III during FY 1977 is the result of a \$2 million transfer from EOF to help start the new Tuition Aid Grant (TAG) Program. The increases in Article III are primarily due to additional dollars to support the summer program and increases in the amount of the student financial aid grant.

The next set of slides depicted the Board's actual request as submitted to the CHE, CHE's recommendation to the governor vs. the actual appropriation recommended by the governor and approved by the legislature. Mr. Havens pointed out that based on the Board's analysis of the programs' needs in 1994 the Article III slides show that the Fund still hasn't received what was requested in FY 1994, which was \$22,576 million, since the current FY 2002 appropriation is \$21,910 million. The Article IV slide depicting request vs. appropriation also indicates that the Board's FY1993 request of \$12,949 million in Article IV has still not been met in FY 2002 with a current appropriation of \$11,385 million. The Board believes that the summer program is so important that slightly over 25% of the total EOF budget is spent on that component. Several years ago

the Board took a \$1.4 million dollar increase in Article III and invested it in the summer program. One of the slides shared with the Board has become a fixture in the budget materials that the staff sends the CHE as well as the OMB. This slide compares the actual Article IV appropriation from FY 1995 through FY 2002 adjusted for inflation against the annual consumer price index (CPI), against the TAG index (the rate at which TAG grants increase) and compared to the higher education price index (HEPI). If the Article IV appropriation for FY 2002 were increased by the CPI it would be \$12,368 million, by the annual TAG rate of increase it would be \$13,553 million and if the HEPI were used the Article IV appropriation would increase to \$ 14,370 million. The program in actuality is operating with an Article IV appropriation that approximates the FY 1995 budget in terms of purchasing power.

Dr. Lang also called the Board's attention to the staff's proposed outline of FY2003 funding priorities. The CHE/EOF staff recommends that the Board use the original FY2002 EOF funding request, the amount of additional funds requested in appeals by campus EOF programs in their "FY 2002 Funding Renewal Request and Appeal" forms and to adjust the total of both for inflation. He indicated that this is just one approach to toward developing the FY2003 budget request, and includes the expressed needs of the program directors so they can continue to provide EOF students with basic services. What it does not include, because the staff did not request that information, is what it would cost for each of the programs to provide the optimum level of student support services.

Mr. Jolly expressed an interest in knowing what the experts indicate is a realistic student to counselor ratio to do an effective job. Dr. Lang stated that many years ago the CHE/EOF staff discussed the preferable ratio with the entire EOF community and arrived at 75:1. However, since that time counselors have acquired additional responsibilities that may make that ratio outdated. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding costing out program services and providing the CHE/EOF staff with some direction to begin the development of the FY2003 funding request. The models suggested in addition to the staff's proposal were an "allocation per student" and "basket of services" approach. Mr. Jolly also added that the Board members are not advocates just for the students who are in the program, but also for every targeted citizen who meets the criteria. The Board's obligation therefore, established under the legislation is to advocate for all who are entitled and meet the criteria.

Mr. Havens asked the Board to consider developing a public educational forum as an additional step to move the FY2003 budget process to a more successful conclusion. To do this, the Board would need to identify other organizations and groups as supporters, sources of outside funding, alumni with a background in public relations, other alumni and a location for the event. The Board members discussed possible contacts such as: the Presidents' Council, the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the Council of County Colleges, the Chamber of Commerce, the Partnership for New Jersey, League of Municipalities, the Organization of 100 Black Men.

Mr. Jolly suggested that the Board establish a relationship with two or three media representatives who would become expertly informed and passionate about the Board's message. The other part of using the media is actually getting them to cover the event. It might be good to seek outside help with this aspect.

Dr. Lang asked what is the Board's timeline for the public educational forum? Mr. Havens replied that it would have to be late October and certainly before the election, particularly since the goal is to include the gubernatorial candidates.

The question of where the forum will actually take place was also discussed. The Board members expressed a strong preference for the event to be held in Newark, since it is a major urban setting and a media center. Mr. Jolly asked if there was a prohibition on financial sponsorship from a corporation or two. Dr. Lang replied that no such prohibition existed and in fact it would be his preferred route, since the use of public funds for an advocacy forum does not sound appropriate. Mr. Jolly said that he would be willing to talk to a few people to determine if they would be interested in underwriting this event. Strategies in garnering public support were discussed.

A title for the forum was debated and after a few suggestions the Board selected "Educational Opportunity in Crisis".

Dr. Flamer suggested that if this event is tied to inviting the gubernatorial candidates to a forum to hear their ideas and issues about educational opportunity, EOF may also want to include College Bound. An urban location was decided upon such as the New Jersey Performing Arts Center. The preference is not to use a college campus, but if you must turn to a college campus contact the Rutgers University Newark campus where the program got its initial start.

Dr. Lang was asked to research what restrictions exist in the Board's administrative budget. His response was that the Board's administrative budget is actually not that large, it may total \$4,000 - \$5,000 and is primarily used for the meetings and travel reimbursement. Most of the activities sponsored by the Board are funded with Article IV because they are statewide activities.

Mr. Jolly stated that he would follow-up on the sponsorship question in terms of facility location and event funding.

On Sunday, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

"EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN CRISIS" FORUM

SPONSORS

--

MESSAGE

General Goal Specific - \$

AUDIENCES

Gubernatorial candidates legislature media
--

TIMING

Before November 6, 2001 Gubernatorial Election
--

ATTENDANCE

Gubernatorial Candidates Members of New Jersey Assembly & Senate EOF Directors, Students & Alumni

SUPPORTERS

New Jersey Presidents' Council Association of Independent Colleges & Universities (AICUNJ) Council of County Colleges Partnership New Jersey Chamber of Commerce Black Ministers Council One Hundred Black Men Unions
--

Monday, July 16, 2001

Ms. M. Wilma Harris was introduced as the newest representative to the EOF Board. Ms. Harris is the new Chairperson of the Higher Education Student Assistance Authority (HESAA) and served as the chair of the Student Assistance Board (SAB) prior to the creation of HESAA.

Chairperson Havens called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. In particular, thanks were offered to Father Loughran, President of Saint Peter's College for graciously hosting the EOF Board retreat/meeting. The Board members who had an opportunity to tour Saint Peter's College found the visit insightful.

Father Loughran thanked the Board for its comments and indicated that in addition to being the President of Saint Peter's College he is also the Chair of the Presidents' Council. He stated that it has occurred to him that the EOF Board and the Presidents' Council might better collaborate and he extended a spot on the agenda of a Presidents' Council meeting for a presentation and discussion on EOF, especially how both groups might better advocate together. Dr. King asked Father Loughran if the Presidents' Council has ever considered a seat on the EOF Board similar to the CHE. Father Loughran indicated that he was not aware of what dynamics would have to take place to make that possible, but was certain that there would be college and university presidents glad to serve.

Mr. Havens indicated that the Board would explore the logistics of having someone from the Presidents' Council sit on the EOF Board as well as the EOF Board making a presentation to the Presidents' Council and get back to him.

Father Loughran also stated that the legislature asked several questions regarding the EOF program during the appropriation committee hearings and spoke quite highly of the program. However, the one thing that higher education lacks in the legislature as pointed out to him by Assemblyman Doria and Congressman Melendez is a "champion".

Approval of the Minutes of the April 12, 2001 Conference Call Meeting

Dr. King made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 12, 2001 conference call meeting of the Board. Dr. Flamer seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Resolution 1:02 Approval of Revised 2001 Summer Program Allocations & Article III Graduate Grant Allocations in the Academic Year

Mr. Havens introduced Resolution 1:02 by commenting that Dr. Kim and he had an opportunity to work on the revised 2001 summer program allocations with the staff and asked Dr. Lang and Ms. Flanagan to do a brief presentation. Dr. Lang indicated that in the past changes to the carry-forward language made it possible for the Fund to only use

the previous year's carry-forward funds. As a result, the CHE/EOF staff has moved up the date to recoup Article III academic year student grant funds from institutions so that they can be rededicated to front fund the summer program. In addition, several years ago the Board granted the staff the ability to increase/decrease Article III institutional allocations up to 25% and Article IV up to 10% without first seeking the Board's approval. In order to help the effort to front fund the summer program all refunds received and under-expenditures that were identified from the New Jersey student grant payment system were made available to fund the summer program through the appeal process, while maintaining a small reserve of Article III funds to respond to any potential fall enrollment increases

Ms. Flanagan provided the Board members with a detailed analysis of exactly how institutional appeals were handled. The CHE/EOF staff reviewed summer appeals and exercised its authority to approve up to 25% of the Article III summer cost of education allocation for institutions. As a result institutions received additional Article III funds that met their appeal request or up to 25% of their preliminary summer Article III allocation. In Article IV the only funds available to address institutional appeals were funds that were leftover from the Stevens' Mathematics Immersion Program (MIP), which was not held this summer and totaled \$29,000. Recalling prior Board discussions regarding strengthening county college summer programs, the CHE/EOF staff addressed this sector's Article IV needs first. The Article IV appeal requests were funded up to \$2,999. Several institutions were recommended for Article III summer funds that exceeded the 25% limit and require the Board's approval. The institutions are Felician College which has experienced steady enrollment growth since expanding its dormitory capacity; the Seton Hall Summer Pre-Legal Institute, a long running and successful special summer project that has helped many students gain entrance to law school has been level funded for the last four years; and Ocean County College requested a small sum of money but it was beyond 25% of their preliminary allocation, to help start a new pre-freshman summer orientation program and continue support to their renewal students. Two institutions requested academic year graduate grant funds. The College of Saint Elizabeth has made a serious effort to interest former EOF undergraduates in the pursuit of a master's degree and has requested one slot. Felician College has approached the Board for the first time in a request for five graduate slots for Masters programs- one each in English, mathematics and lay religious studies and two in Nursing.

Dr. Lang added that these appeals were possible because of large balances in academic year Article III student grants however; institutions have been informed that there is no guarantee that this level of funding will be available in FY2003.

Mr. Jolly offered a motion to approve Resolution 1:02 that was seconded by Mr. Avery. The motion was unanimously approved.

Resolution 2:02 Adoption of EOF Grant Deadlines for Academic Year 2002-2003

Dr. Lang introduced Resolution 2:02 as a routine calendar issue that permits the Board to publish deadline dates for submitting the necessary financial aid forms to determine

student eligibility and disburse Article III grant fund payments to the institutions. These deadline dates are aligned with the HESAA since EOF processes student grants from the same grant system used by HESAA and assists institutions in the planning required for the administration of the grant.

Dr. King offered a motion to approve Resolution 2:02. The motion was seconded by Dr. Kim and unanimously approved.

Resolution 3:02 Adoption of 2001-2002 Calendar of Board Meetings

Based upon the Board's discussion of the budget approach the previous evening and the desire of the membership to endorse the actual budget figures prior to the September 20, 2001 meeting, Mr. Jolly inquired about adding a telephone conference call meeting into the schedule during the month of August. Mr. Havens indicated that his recollection of the previous night's conversation was that the staff would share their preliminary recommendations with the Board in mid-August and a decision regarding the need for an August conference call meeting would be made after Board members reviewed the information. Dr. Flamer stated that as a procedural issue the Board should actually vote on the approach that the staff will be using. After a brief discussion, Dr. Flamer made a motion to amend Resolution 3:02 Adoption of 2001-2002 Calendar of Board meeting dates to include a telephone conference call meeting on Monday, August 20, 2001 at 10:00 a.m. The motion was seconded by Dr. King and unanimously approved.

The amended Resolution 3:02 was moved by Mr. Jolly and seconded by Dr. Flamer. The motion was unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Havens summarized the Board's discussion from the day before for the benefit of those who were not at the retreat. A discussion of where the program has been with regard to programmatic and funding issues and funding levels since the restructuring of higher education occurred. The good news is that the program is still very active and able to accomplish much, but from an economic viewpoint the funding and appropriations have not kept pace with the Fund's programmatic needs. As a result, the Board has decided to broaden its view of how it seeks funding and to look at it from two different perspectives. First, consider what the FY2003 dollar request for EOF funding should be under different models. Second, adopt a different approach to getting the funding request approved both short-term vis-à-vis exploring the possibility of a supplemental appropriation this current fiscal year, as well as moving toward a broader advocacy campaign to focus attention on the needs of the program. The broader campaign base will include a fall forum engaging the general public, corporate sector, community groups, legislators and others.

Ms. Harris inquired if the program has tracked data on the students over the past thirty years, because she is certain that there is a story to tell regarding their earning capacity, ability to pay taxes and other contributions that might get the attention of the legislature.

Mr. Havens replied that the Board had done some of that and needs to do more. Clearly no one could deny that the program is in the general public's interest if you look at the students and see their success then you see the value of the program. Dr. Lang commented that the information shared yesterday regarding what the FY2002 EOF appropriation is actually worth in today's dollars has also been shared with the governor and legislators but has received little interest.

Mr. Jolly commented that the Board has to point out that there are now real consequences for doing more with the same and the citizenry of the state must be informed of the Board's public mission and why it is currently in crisis. While the policy makers talk about all of the work they want done, the difference will be that the Board plans to articulate the consequences of one or two more years of level funding.

Mr. Arce asked Dr. Lang what would be the best approach to secure a supplemental or emergency appropriation of Article IV funds for the FY2002. Dr. Lang stated that it is difficult to advise the Board on that matter because during his tenure in New Jersey higher education, he can only recall one request for a supplemental appropriation and that was for the TAG program in 1992/93. Mr. Avery commented that he would be careful about requesting an emergency appropriation, particularly after approving over \$1 million in Article III summer program appeals. Mr. Jolly stated that the Board developed a good plan yesterday that needs to go forward with an emphasis on remaining strategic. Mr. Havens stated that the simple answer to Mr. Arce's question is that the Board and CHE/EOF staff does not know yet. As the Board looks at retooling and articulating the goals and objectives of the program, the Board will have to wait and see how it resonates among the audiences. Mr. Arce explained that he raised the question of a supplemental appropriation as a strategy that allows the Board to create a climate that documents its overwhelming need to whoever succeeds the current governor. Dr. Lang stated that he wished he could provide the Board with better advice, but they needed to understand that all segments of higher education in New Jersey are considered a discretionary expenditure. Other areas of the state budget such as health care, K-12, the courts are legislatively mandated activities. When those types of programs are under-funded it is considered appropriate to ask for a supplemental appropriation to bring them into compliance with the law. When higher education requested a supplemental appropriation for TAG several years ago, it was related to huge increases in enrollment of potentially TAG eligible students at the county colleges. The Chancellor of Higher Education at that time used enormous political capital to secure an additional \$7-8 million supplemental. The crisis is that the campus EOF programs are operating with the same level of resources that they had in FY1995 at 2001 prices.

Ms. Harris asked if (during the thirty-year history of the program) students have been involved in any of the advocacy activities. Mr. Avery indicated that Ms. Softley worked closely with the EOF Student Alliance who met with every legislator in their district and spoke at the public hearings. Mr. Havens stated that he can't take it anymore personally, because as EOF alumnus he also literally appealed to the highest authorities in the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Arce asked if the Board was going on record as saying that the crisis does not require an emergency appropriation. Mr. Havens summarized that an emergency appropriation was one of several options that the Board would be exploring, but not the sole crux of its actions. Mr. Jolly rephrased it by saying that there is no consensus on the part of the Board to make a decision regarding an emergency appropriation at this time. The issue of the crisis will be presented in the broader forum and to get the specific need in writing before a new Governor is elected.

Dr. Lang was asked to make the powerpoint slides concerning the budget history available to all of the Board members. He agreed to put all of the budget history information on the EOF website.

Report of the Nomination Committee

Mr. James Avery chaired the Nomination Committee of the Board and was assisted by Dr. Kim and Ms. Carmen Miranda-Jones. In keeping with the by-laws of the Board, the Chairperson of the EOF Board serves for one year and at the conclusion of the annual meeting the current vice-chairperson assumes the chairmanship. Thus the responsibility of the Nominating Committee was to nominate a candidate for the position of vice-chair for the 2001-02 academic year and so doing nominated Mr. Al Arce for the office of vice-chairperson and chair-elect. Mr. Avery also moved the nomination. Mr. Havens asked if there were any nominations from the floor and after hearing none, Mr. Jolly seconded Mr. Arce's nomination. The motion was unanimously approved. The Board offered its congratulations to Mr. Arce.

Summary of Key Actions Taken at the Last Three HESAA Board Meetings

Dr. Lang indicated the most significant thing in Mr. Avery's report is that the Governor and legislature removed all of HESAA's "carry-forward" ability, which removed the Authority's flexibility to respond to enrollment shifts/increases. It was common for HESAA to carry a 3-4% reserve fund, similar to the way the EOF Board reserves academic year Article III funds to respond to enrollment increases. Ms. Harris stated that the carry-forward funds were always kept at that level so HESAA would never be placed in the position of having to request a supplemental appropriation to fund TAG as in 1992.

Dr. Lang added that the state treasurer was given the authority to approve a supplemental appropriation without having to go back to the legislature should TAG applications increase. Ms. Harris said that currently the applications received exceed the projection and if the trend holds true, the treasurer is authorized to make up the difference based on actual applications.

New Business

Mr. Havens introduced Ms. Giannina Perez, Managing Director of INROADS, New Jersey. who he met at the NJEOFPA student day conference this past March where they discussed developing a formal relationship between the EOF Board, the campus

programs and INROADS. An invitation was extended to Ms. Perez to provide the full Board with a brief presentation.

Ms. Perez thanked Mr. Havens for the invitation and indicated that in addition to representing the New Brunswick office she was also speaking on behalf of the Newark and Philadelphia INROADS affiliates which covers the southern tip of New Jersey.

Ms. Perez explained that INROADS has been in existence for 30 years and started in Chicago with the goal of increasing the number of "people of color" in professional positions in the corporate sector. INROADS started with 25 interns and 17 corporate sponsors in 1970. Today, the program has grown nationwide as well as internationally to over 7,000 interns, in 900 consolidated organizations, 52 affiliates strong, in 36 states, as well as Canada and Mexico. New Jersey INROADS has over 456 interns and 115 corporate clients who serve as partners with the organization. INROADS is primarily a career development organization working primarily with African-American, Latino and Native American students providing training, development and placement. Student recruitment is handled in conjunction with sponsoring companies who identify the academic qualifications and skill sets that they are looking for in student interns. INROADS then identifies three or four students who meet the qualifications and are called in for interviews by the sponsoring company. The company selects the student they would like to have as an intern. Interns receive corporate readiness training and development that supplements what they have learned in their college courses. In addition the INROADS staff works with the student interns year round serving as "career coaches". The final phase of the INROADS program is placement in a full-time position, upon graduation. Students are recruited as high school seniors through their sophomore year of college. The program also considers college juniors who are willing to commit two summers to an internship before they graduate.

After speaking with several people familiar with EOF including EOF alumni, Ms. Perez said she recognized the potential for a partnership with the programs. Over the past five years the competition among students for internships has become fierce. Companies are looking for young people with particular skill sets earlier than ever before and looking to organizations like INROADS to help meet the demand. Ms. Perez is looking to develop a formal partnership with the EOF Board of Directors to officially provide all of INROADS services to campus EOF programs across the state

Ms. Softley inquired if INROADS recruitment activities also extended to students enrolled in county colleges. Ms. Perez answered that the organization also recruits from county colleges, but specifically looks for county college students that plan to transfer to a four-year college or university and that internship opportunities are available to county college students who are on a four-year track, because the corporate clients are seeking students who plan to earn a baccalaureate degree.

Mr. Arce asked if the organization was proprietary and what it would cost for EOF to enter this partnership. Ms. Perez replied that INROADS is a non-profit organization and funded by a sponsorship fee. There is an annual fee of \$4,000 for each student enrolled

in the program and the sponsoring corporation pays that fee. This partnership will not cost the colleges and universities any money.

Ms. Harris commented that she could be a poster child for INROADS as her employer is a beneficiary of the kind of individuals that the organization refers. It would be excellent exposure for the EOF students to become involved with INROADS. This year Prudential has 25 students from INROADS.

Dr. Lang provided the Board with some background information on this endeavor. He added that he has had an opportunity to attend some of INROADS awards ceremonies where the intern is at the event with his/her mentor. Individuals who have substantive decision/policy making authority in their corporate organizations are mentoring students.

Mr. Jolly made a motion that the CHE/EOF staff develops a memorandum of understanding between the EOF Board and INROADS for the Board's consideration at the September 20, 2001 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Avery and unanimously approved by the Board.

Comments from the Public

Dr. Grimmatt of Rutgers University challenged the Board to begin looking at graduate education and graduate professional development as an activity that needs a larger degree of the Board's focus, time and attention.

Mr. Trevor Williams, Assistant Dean of Stevens Institute of Technology, commended the Board members for taking the time out of their busy schedules to visit the respective Hudson County campuses. At Stevens the visit heightened the level of awareness and focus placed on EOF and increased the institutional understanding that the program and its staff are also accountable to a larger entity. The visit sent an important message to the administrators at the respective campuses and he encouraged the Board members to continue their program observation visits in the future.

Mr. Havens also thanked all of the institutions that hosted the members of the EOF Board and commented that the visits were quite informative.

Dr. Ann Guillory of Felician College thanked the Board for their continued support and particularly for approving the allocations for additional summer Article III funds and the academic year graduate grant slots.

Comments from Recent Past EOF Chair

Mr. Havens indicated that he feels as though he has completed a life cycle to a certain extent, after being an EOF student, going through the college ranks and now chairperson of the EOF Board. The experience has been a personal goal and pleasure. Anytime in life when you can do something to have a positive impact on one person it is a great thing. The EOF Board literally impacts the life of thousands of people and the beauty of

the experience is that the individuals don't have a clue as to who the EOF Board is. It is wonderful to see what the Board does and the value it offers. One of the challenges for the Board is that it knows that the program changes lives, sees it and feels it and the impact it has on people. He guessed the Board kept it all in the family, so the family knows what EOF does, but he thinks the Board needs to broaden its family. It has been his personal honor and pleasure working with all of the Board members, CHE/EOF staff and campus EOF staff. From a professional and Board point of view, after serving as chair for a year he realized that it has taken him about a year to get in the "groove" and there is still probably more that he doesn't know. He strongly suggested to the Board that they look at changing or modifying the by-laws, because a one-year term as chair is actually too short and is a disservice to the Board. Mr. Havens then officially turned the chair over to Dr. Kim.

Resolution 4:02 In Recognition of Mr. Ellsworth C. Havens for his Outstanding Leadership as Chairperson of the EOF Board of Directors

Dr. Kim thanked Mr. Havens for all of his efforts and meetings with the governor and his staff to increase the program's funding. On behalf of the EOF Board members, the EOF executive director and his staff, the members of the EOF Professional Association and students, Dr. Kim presented Mr. Havens with a framed resolution from the Board as a token of appreciation in recognition of his outstanding leadership as chairperson during the 2000-01 academic year.

Mr. Havens thanked everyone and stated that although the position is meant to be challenging it has also been fun and exciting working with the staff and the other members of the Board.

Mr. Jolly, in reflection, stated that he recognizes how much work Mr. Havens did behind the scene. He also stated that in some conversations with Mr. Havens he really believed that the FY2002 appropriation outcome for EOF was going to be different from what materialized and that he put himself on the line not only with the EOF Board members, but several other folks. Mr. Jolly stated that he tips his hat to him. A lot of people will invest on the periphery and not give of themselves in the manner in which Mr. Havens did. He added that it is not Mr. Haven's failure if others nod and then don't act. In no way does he, nor should anyone else hold Mr. Havens accountable because he really expended a great deal of his political capitol on EOF and folks need to know that. "I want to acknowledge it publicly and tell you that I appreciate it because I know how lonely it can get in those rooms when you are meeting with people and walk out thinking that you have a deal, thank you", added Mr. Jolly.

Mr. Arce also indicated his thanks to Mr. Havens. He also commented that he learned a great deal from Mr. Havens and that he was very professional and informative.

Ms. Softley commented that on behalf of the NJEOFPA Mr. Havens efforts in getting Acting Governor DiFrancesco to the conference were appreciated, particularly since former Governor Christine Todd Whitman was the only governor who never attended an

EOF conference. The Governor's attendance at the conference did the students a world of good and for all of his efforts on behalf of the Fund she offered thanks.

Adjournment

Dr. Kim called for a motion to adjourn the meeting that was offered by Mr. Avery and seconded by Dr. Flamer. The motion was unanimous and the meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.